R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 719 JC 680 222

ACADEMIC RANK CRITERIA IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES.

BY- KILPATRICK, GORDON

REPORT NUMBER ECC-65-24 PUB DATE JUL 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.92 21P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE FACULTY, COLLEGE TEACHERS, PROFESSORS, *ACADEMIC RANK (PROFESSIONAL), *FACULTY PROMOTION, TEACHER PROMOTION,

ACADEMIC RANK IS INCREASING IN FREQUENCY IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES. THE PRIMARY REASON FOR ADOPTION OF RANK IS A DESIRE TO IDENTIFY WITH SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FOLLOWED BY HOPES OF INCREASING STATUS AND MORALE, OF RELATING SALARY TO TEACHING PROFICIENCY, OF ATTRACTING BETTER FACULTY AND OF FACILITATING ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLICATIONS. INITIAL PLACEMENT OF FACULTY IN THE RANK SYSTEM HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS ONE OF THE MOST COMMON SOURCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERRORS. IT SHOULD BE BASED ON EVALUATION OF TRANSCRIPTS, LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION, AND PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE. PROMOTION, WHICH SHOULD BE A REWARD FOR SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE, IS TOO FREQUENTLY A REWARD FOR LONGEVITY. PROMOTION SHOULD BE BASED ON PERFORMANCE, EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS, PROFESSIONAL STUDY AND GROWTH, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE. A BIBLIOGRAPHY IS INCLUDED. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ECC 65-24

ED020719

"Academic Rank Criteria in American Junior Colleges"

by

Gordon Kilpatrick

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 15 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

July, 1965

University of California, Los Angeles

Los Angeles, California

JC 680 022

INTRODUCTION

Academic rank is enjoying increased popularity among American junior colleges. That more junior colleges presently have academic rank than in the past should not surprise the reader, since it is well known that new junior colleges are being created frequently. At the same time, adoption of academic rank is more likely than elimination of such after it has become an established practice. The real impact is realized when it is noted that while only 19.3% of existing public junior colleges had academic rank in 1962, 32% of those existing in 1964 had academic rank.[1] Since the base number to which these percentages apply increased appreciably during the two-year interval, and since new junior colleges are seldom constituted initially with academic rank, it is likely that a much larger percentage increase would be in evidence had the 1964 study been limited to institutions two years old or older.

Academic rank does not enjoy such widespread popularity in California. A possible deterrent to its acceptance in California might be lack of correlation between salary and academic rank which is in evidence elsewhere.[2] California's salary schedules almost universally relate compensation to educational attainments, with appointment or promotion to academic rank serving mainly as a prestige factor. Thus the California public education system offers pecuniary incentives toward production of highly educated faculties without provision for evaluating or rewarding teaching

---

[1]Clyde E. Blocker, "Academic Rank in Two-Year Colleges," Junior College Journal, 35 (December-January, 1964-65), p. 22.

[2]A survey of sixty-five junior colleges with academic rank indicated that about four out of five public junior colleges and about two out of three private junior colleges had a correlation between academic rank and salary. Ibid., p. 24.

effectiveness.[3]

Correlation between teaching effectiveness and salary is found twice as often in private junior colleges as in public junior colleges. These private junior colleges encourage teacher proficiency via promotions and/or salary adjustments for meritorious service. This is in vivid contrast to the public junior college salary schedule which automatically awards an annual increment to faculty members who have rendered merely adequate service for another year, but fails to recognize outstanding achievement.[4]

What is the result of introducing academic rank into educational institution? The answer to this question may be divided into two parts: 1) how it affects the overall personality of the faculty, and 2) how it affects the community of which the school is a part. Hendrix investigated the personality factors of junior college faculties with and without academic rank and compared both of these groups with "eminent university teachers" as a standard. When compared with junior college faculties without academic rank, he found that faculties of junior colleges with academic rank tended to be more resourceful, independent, alert, self-sufficient, and to possess greater general intelligence. At the same time, they tended to be more jealous, suspicious, tyrannical, irritable, socially insecure, and to possess inner tensions. Additional characteristics included radicalism, introversion, emphasis on correct behavior, strong inclinations toward experimental approaches to problem solving, preoccupation with scientific and analytical thought processes to the neglect of religion and the humanities, less regard for custom and tradition, and less inclination to

---

[3]Some school districts in California reward outstanding teachers with additional annual salary increments.

[4]Blocker, op. cit., p. 23.

accept technical, vocational, and occupational curricula. Hendrix noted also that many of these characteristics are in common with scientists, executives, politicians, and criminals. The consummation of these characteristics in a junior college faculty with academic rank results in a faculty which possesses a greater percentage of doctorates (possibly the result of a requirement for admission to the higher ranks), more young degrees (first degree before the age of 26), less experience, more non-members of scholarly and/or teacher organizations, fewer teacher-college degrees, more large-city childhoods, more members whose fathers were of professional, managerial, or technical occupations, and more members who have been in their present position five years or less. The latter factor would indicate a higher turnover among faculties with academic rank. The exact reasons for this are unknown, but might be associated either with dissatisfaction with the particular junior college involved or with lack of commitment. Hendrix contends also that poor interpersonal relationships result in junior colleges with academic rank, both intrafaculty relations and student-faculty relations. This might be a manifestation of the aforementioned jealousy and inner tension. There does seem to be some association between the presence of academic rank and a higher level of intelligence and mental alertness.[5] It is of interest to note from the personality profile test data used by Hendrix, that junior college faculties with academic rank were rated as having less-desirable characteristics than their unranked counterparts in eight categories, yet in two of these

---

[5]Vernon L. Hendrix, "Academic Rank: Mostly Peril?" Junior College Journal, 34 (December-January, 1963-64), p. 29; Vernon L. Hendrix, "Academic Rank Revisited," Junior College Journal, 35 (February, 1965) p. 26.

categories, they scored better than the "eminent university teachers" used as a model.[6] The six remaining categories scored as "undesirable" compare favorably in number with the six categories scored as "desirable."

The effect on the community of introduction of academic rank into a junior college has not been studied extensively. A possible hindrance to such a study might be a lack of knowledge of community opinion prior to introduction of the academic rank. This opinion might be altered or at least colored by the announcement of intention to adopt or of actual adoption of academic rank in the local junior college, which probably was the basis for initiating the study. A recent sampling of public opinion indicated opinions ranging from disinterest to the statement, "Rank has raised the educational level of [junior college] faculties in Wyoming.[7] Public opinion contrary to the adoption of academic rank seems to be virtually non-existent. Even in California, where the junior college academic rank idea has been slow in acceptance and adoption, the feeling is that conditions are favorable for adoption of academic rank in the junior colleges.[8] Apparently, the populus possesses a sense of sharing in the prestige elevation supposedly inherent in adoption of academic rank. Its appeal is also in evidence by such statements as, "Establishment of academic rank provides increased status, greater community prestige, and improvement in personal welfare of the teaching staffs."[9]

---

[6] Ibid.

[7] John C. Harrington, "Academic Rank in the Community College," Junior College Journal, 35 (March, 1965), p. 26

[8] Ibid.

[9] Los Angeles City Schools, "Plan for Establishment of Academic Rank in the Colleges in the Los Angeles College District," (February, 1964).

It might be appropriate at this point to ask who instigates the idea adoption of junior college academic rank. The leader in this movement appears to be the administration. It alone was the source of impetus 32% of the time in a recent survey of fifty-three public junior colleges. If we include joint efforts with faculty and/or governing board, the figure rises to 62%. Faculty efforts accounted for 17% singly and 41.5% jointly with other bodies. The governing board was involved 21% singly and 32% jointly. The pattern carries over into the thirty-five private junior colleges with academic rank which were studied, in which the administration involved itself 57.1% of the time alone and 68.6% jointly.[10] Apparently the administration has "discovered" that academic rank adds prestige, stimulates and rewards professional growth, and thus facilitates recruitment and retention.[11] However, once academic rank has been adopted, the presidents of larger schools apparently lose interest, leaving appointment and promotional procedures to the appropriate dean.[12]

It is desirable to determine the faculty's opinions on the question of academic rank before attempting to introduce it. This is often done by secret ballot. If the majority of the faculty is not in favor, it would be foolhardy for an administrator to force it upon them. Such a determination was made in the Los Angeles Junior College Districts. Majorities of the faculties of six of the seven existing junior colleges indicated their desire for academic rank. No attempt will be made to introduce it into the seventh junior college.

---

[10]Blocker, loc. cit.

[11]Letters to the Editor, Junior College Journal, 35 (March, 1965), p. 27.

[12]Fred B. Millett, Professor, (New York: The McMillan Company, 1961), p.91.

Several studies have been conducted to determine why junior colleges adopt academic rank. Most researchers agree that the primary reason for adoption in public junior college is a desire to identify or conform with their university counterparts.[13] Other reasons which were given by public junior colleges include, in descending order of frequency, to increase status and morale of faculty, to link salary with teaching proficiency, and to attract better faculty. Private junior colleges most often listed the linking of salary with teaching proficiency as their reason for adoption. Increasing status and morale of faculty was second in frequency with three reasons tied for third: to conform with university practice, to recognize and reward service, and to improve the faculty by motivating graduate study (the latter likely a promotion requirement). It is interesting to note that the latter three reasons ranked first, sixth, and seventh in frequency among public junior colleges.[14]

The academic ranks most often adopted in junior colleges conform closely to the university system. Thus the full-time faculty may be ranked from instructor, through the intermediary ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, to full professor. Of these, instructor is the lowest rank, finding its use mostly among newly appointed faculty without extensive experience. The instructor rank may be thought of as a temporary rank, since tenure and promotion to assistant professor frequently come together. This does not preclude the possibility of higher ranks lacking tenure, since initial appointments to higher ranks or earlier promotions are commonplace.

---

[13]Blocker, loc. cit.; Letters to the Editor, Junior College Journal, loc. cit.; Los Angeles City Schools, loc. cit.

[14]Blocker, op. cit., p. 24.

After a brief apprenticeship as instructor, the successful teacher finds entry into the higher ranks. The inclusion of the word "professor" in his title with or without preceding modifiers seems to cast a prestigious aura about the holder. He finds his publications are suddenly more easily accepted.[15] Salary might increase. Many social barriers now fall away.

Other a demic ranks which are sometimes used include lecturer (for part-time or temporary teaching personnel), professor emeritous (for retired professors), visiting professor, and many variations of these. These are mentioned for information only. Attention will now be centered on appointment and promotion criteria as applied to the most commonly used academic ranks, namely instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

APPOINTMENT

"Most of the mistakes made by department heads and deans are made in this [initial appointment] area of responsibility."[16] The basis of this statement can take two forms: 1) newly appointed personnel may be appointed to a higher rank than their experience and proficiency justify, and 2) newly appointed personnel may be appointed to a lower rank than their experience and proficiency justify. Both of these result from an improper assessment of the individual capabilities. Judgments are weighted heavily upon transcripts, letters of recommendation, résumé of previous experience, and ability to become credentialed. Little effort is expended to determine if extenuating circumstance contributed to poor grades, the nature of the

---

[15] H. T. Frieberger and W. H. Crawford, "Junior College Academic Rank and Title," Junior College Journal, 33 (October, 1962, p. 89.

[16] L. S. Woodburne, Principles of College and University Administration, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 48.

school awarding the grades, the various standards as apply to various curricula, etc. Too often the appointing official forgets that the applicant tends to list only those references which will give him a good recommendation. Does the applicant's impressive record of previous teaching experience reflect the quality of his teaching?

Many Ca fornia school districts spare junior college officials the burden (and risk) of this perilous task of evaluation of an applicant's qualifications by assigning this responsibility to a director of personnel. Thus, it is possible for an applicant who made high grades in a non-academic curriculum, who furnished the "right" references, who has an impressive quantity of academic experience, and who presented an above average impression at the interview to report for work with a meager knowledge of subject matter and a less than average teaching ability. Thus he plagues his department head and cheats his students for at least the term of his one-year contract. Meanwhile the highly capable applicant worked his way through school, while pursuing a rigorous academic curriculum through a college or graduate school known for its higher standards. He is rejected on grades alone. Who is better able to evaluate an applicant's knowledge of subject matter and teaching ability than a department head, himself well versed in the applicant's field? Perhaps the university practice of inviting an applicant to present a lecture on a pertinent subject of his own choice to the faculty has merit at the junior college level. Then the department head could make recommendations to the hiring official with or without counsel of his colleagues.

How does the hiring official approach such a problem? The following questions and suggestions might serve as guidelines to evaluation:

1. Transcript evaluation
   a. Did the applicant work his way through school?
   b. Was his curriculum one of the more rigorous curricula? Or the converse?
   c. Do the academic standards or the grading policies at his alma mater seriously restrict or allow a generous number of high grades?
   d. Did the applicant experience accident, illness, death of a loved one, military service, or trauma during the grading period which might deleteriously affect his grades?

2. Letters of recommendation
   a. The references furnished by the applicant will all tend to be favorable, since he selected them. Are any of these references well known in their field? Are any known personally by the evaluator?
   b. By far, the best and most reliable source of information about the applicant will be his former employers and/or teachers. Exploit these sources to the fullest possible extent. They are more likely to be unbiased.

3. Previous experience
   a. Does his experience other than his teaching experience contribute to his value as a successful teacher? If so, give him credit for it.
   b. Is he a "floater," spending less than two years at each of several jobs, his reasons for changing being other than military service, additional education, or the like?
   c. What was the quality of his work? The aforementioned letters of reference from previous employers should be examined carefully for insight into this question.

4. Evaluation
   a. If the evaluator is not versed in the field of the applicant, the appropriate department head, preferably the one who is the applicant's potential immediate superior, should be invited to attend and participate in the interview. The evaluator should heed comments and recommendations made by the department head subsequent to the interview.
   b. If at all possible, the applicant should be invited to give a presentation on a subject of his choice within his field. The entire departmental faculty should be invited (plus interested students for the subject content). Mode and manner of presentation should be observed carefully. Digestability of subject content should be determined. Subsequently, comments should be invited from faculty members; a recommendation should be formulated by the department head and considered by the hiring official before a final decision is made.

Upon completion of evaluation, the question arises to which academic rank should the applicant be appointed. In junior colleges, this decision is heavily influenced by previous experience. In the technical and vocational areas, this experience is not necessarily teaching experience; on the other hand, related experience other than teaching in the liberal arts area seems to receive minor consideration. Other factors include the applicant's educational attainments (again apparently of lesser importance in the technical and vocational area) and the existing criteria of promotion once within the academic ranking system.

Administrators sometime admit that different criteria must be applied in different areas of instruction. Administrators are seldom in agreement on how different these criteria must be. Junior colleges tend to follow the pattern set by the universities, in which liberal arts universities have been observed to habitually appoint a larger percentage to lower ranks and fewer to higher ranks.[17] The faculty member in the technical or vocational area seems to be the favored child at the expense of his liberal arts counterpart. The author finds no argument with allowing relevant outside experience to count in lieu of previous teaching experience or higher degrees in appropriate areas. Rather, it is proposed that a more liberal approach be used. Thus if a technical applicant with a B.S. and eight years of non-teaching experience is initially appointed assistant professor on the basis of his experience, should not the physics major with his M.S. and six years of experience also be an assistant professor? Do the years spent in graduate study with tuition, book-costs, fees, living expenses, and little or no income count less than salaried years of experience? No additional

---

[17]H. K. Newburn, Faculty Personnel Policies in State Universities, (Missoula: Montana State University, 1959) p. 10.

proposals or guidelines will be made at this point. If the previously proposed evaluation guidelines are applied in conjunction with the promotions criteria proposals at the end of the next section, equitable decisions concerning assignment of newly appointed personnel to academic rank may be derived.

PROMOTION

"Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the most critical problem confronted in...any university is the proper evaluation of faculty service, and giving due recognition through the impartial assignment of status."[18] Upon whom must the burden of this critical problem fall? In all junior colleges, the responsibility is borne by the president, although in many cases, the final authority and decision lies elsewhere.[19] As previously stated, in larger schools presidents usually take little interest in promotion procedures. In such cases, the president bases his decision (to promote or to recommend promotion to the governing board) on recommendations submitted by department heads,[20] usually through the appropriate dean who may or may not endorse the recommendation. Who better knows the candidate's capabilities and achievements than the department head who has worked with and viewed the candidate most closely in the academic environment? Failure to promote

---

[18]Logan Wilson, The Academic Man, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 112.

[19]Of twenty-five surveyed public junior colleges, in twelve cases the board of control was the final authority, acting upon recommendations of the president. A joint faculty-administration committee operated in the other thirteen. Of twenty private junior colleges surveyed, the president was the final authority in nineteen with only one faculty-administration committee. Blocker, op. cit.

[20]Millett, loc. cit.

a candidate on the recommendation of his department head indicates a lack of confidence in that department head.[21] A five-member faculty committee on promotion has been suggested by one author, such to be elected by secret ballot of the faculty every three years.[22] Without further designation of membership, it is easily imagined how such a committee could be dominated by larger departments, while small departments would find scant representation.

Why promote? Few will argue with the premise that promotion should be a reward for superior performance, yet too often it is used as a reward for longevity. Mere length of mediocre but adequate service does not make one deserving of promotion. Even in schools with no salary schedule of set annual increments, the idea of an annual increase in salary is ingrained. In schools where salary ranges for the various academic ranks do not overlap, it is necessary to promote a teacher merely to give him his expected annual increase in salary. Thus, salary levels exert some control of promotion dates. Many promotions have their source in outside offers to faculty members. It has been the practice in some areas for some faculty members to seek such offers without intention or desire to leave their present position, but merely to obtain promotion. The resulting promotion may take the form of rank, salary, or both. Capable, deserving faculty members without outside offers may get nothing.[23] If a faculty member does not deserve promotion without such an offer, does he suddenly become more deserving upon receiving the offer? Perhaps it would be to the advantage of all

---

[21]Woodburne, op. cit., p. 79.

[22]Frieberger, op. cit.

[23]Newburn, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

parties concerned if the candidate were allowed to accept the offer.

What must a faculty member do to be promoted? Quite often persons least knowledgeable in this area are the faculty members themselves. In answer to a questionnaire, "Have you been given a clear definition of what you should do, in scholarly work and teaching, in order to merit promotion?," twenty-one teachers answered yes, while one-hundred and sixteen answered no.[24] Qualifications for promotion to each rank should be available in clear written form to both administration and faculty.[25]

Teaching effectiveness rates first in importance as criteria for promotion in junior college.[26] In spite of this, teaching effectiveness ranked second to professional growth in frequency of response to a questionnaire on criteria for promotion in junior colleges. Productive scholarship rated very high in frequency of occurrence as criteria for junior college promotion. Surprisingly, 32% of public junior colleges surveyed required research and publication as prerequisite for promotion.[27] In most junior colleges, scholastic productivity or reputation in field of specialty is of secondary interest, while personal qualities are given greater weight as promotion criteria.[28] Professional competency, activity in professional or scholarly organizations, institutional service, and community service are cited with increasing frequency as valid criteria for promotion.

---

[24]Wilson, op. cit., p. 62.

[25]Woodburne, op. cit., p. 52.

[26]Millett, op. cit., p. 92; L. S. Woodburne, Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), p. 20; Wilson, op. cit., p. 101.

[27]Blocker, loc. cit.

[28]Wilson, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

Woodburne states four criteria of merit for promotion: effective teaching, scholarship, contributions to profession, and committee and administrative work. He did not comment on the relative weight each should be given, but did suggest a means to evaluate each area. Since the latter two are of secondary importance to the junior college level, and since their evaluation is self-evident, attention will be directed toward the first two. Teaching effectiveness may be evaluated via student opinion polls, follow-up studies of student performance in subsequent related courses, alumni opinions, and judgment of colleagues.[29] The latter is difficult to ascertain objectively, since it is not customary for faculty members to visit other classes. When it occurs as a part of evaluation, the teacher is less likely to be himself. His self-consciousness coupled with his successful or unsuccessful attempt to "put his best foot forward" is hardly likely to give a true picture of his teaching effectiveness. Perhaps if this practice were more widespread as a recognized and expected occurrence, it would find greater utility in the evaluation process.

Scholarship may be evaluated by examining the character of the teacher's advanced degrees, evidence of his continual education since his last degree, his scholarly participation in learned societies, and his publications.[30]

Time-in-rank finds widespread acceptance as a criterion for promotion in spite of strong condemnation by authorities of educational personnel policy. Is it fair to relegate the progress of a man's development to the calendar? "Advancement should be in response to attainment of qualifications

---

[29]Woodburne, Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, op. cit., pp. 26-33.

[30]Woodburne, Principles of College and University Administration, op. cit., p. 69.

rather than to length of service."[31] Recognizing this, Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, announced this month his intent to change military promotion policy relating to the time-in-rank requirement. Apparently, he agreed that the time-in-rank requirement stifles real opportunities for abler, younger men[32] and that all would benefit from a system of promotion flexible enough to incorporate criteria other than longevity of service.[33] "Quality of performance does not march by years, and to elevate time-serving into a major policy is an admission of a lack of courage to make discriminating decisions."[34]

Systems without time-in-rank requirements sometimes hint of unwritten requirements when mention is made of the "normal" term of an instructor, assistant professor, etc. This varies from 2-7 years for instructor,[35] 6-7 years as an assistant professor, 5-6 years as an associate professor. Some schools require a certain number of years of previous college teaching experience in lieu of time-in-rank, but some make this an additional requirement. Some schools appoint all new faculty members as instructors and promotion and tenure come together at the end of three years if reappointed. Many administrators reserve the right to appoint at any level, regardless of the candidate's ability to meet established criteria, tenure being withheld usually for at least three years. Once appointed, the faculty member is thereafter subject to the established criteria. If years of teaching experience

---

[31]Woodburne, Principles of College and University Administration, op. cit., p. 70.

[32]Woodburne, Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, op. cit., p. 40.

[33]Letters to the Editor, Junior College Journal, loc. cit.

[34]Woodburne, Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, op. cit., p. 39.

[35]Instructors reaching the upper limit of this range are usually in the up-or-out category, that is, if they are not promoted, they are not reappointed. Likely, tenure has been withheld.

is not a criterion, but time-in-rank is, imagine a situation in which two instructors with essentially the same qualifications are employed, one with two years of teaching experience at his present place of employment, the other with two years of teaching experience elsewhere. The first will be eligible for promotion in one year; the other will be eligible only after three years.

It is nc the intent of this author to make proposals concerning the structure within which academic rank criteria are applied. For example, whether or not academic rank is correlated with salary seems immaterial. Merit can be seen in either case. Thus no proposal is made in this regard. It is the intent to make generalized proposals which will fit into any existing structure with minimum modification. The criteria proposed should be applied equally to all faculty, regardless of area of specialization. It is not the intent to victimize any segment by increasing stringency of requirements, but rather to benefit all concerned via a liberalization of requirements in some areas. Specific criteria will be proposed for each rank in one area; general comments will be made in other areas, the required level of attainment for each rank being left to the discretion of the official recommending promotion.

The criteria for promotion in a junior college having academic rank should be performance, educational attainments, professional standing and growth, and community service. It is not expected that the candidate should excel in all areas; outstanding achievement in one or more with at least superior achievement in not less than two of the other areas should qualify one for promotion. In no case, should performance be the criteria neglected.

Time-in-rank as a criterion is notably absent for reasons already given. Such a requirement would stifle the development of capable faculty members

whose potential allows a faster rate of development then than the usual time-in-rank requirement permits. It is assumed that total related previous experience, whether in teaching or not, is considered when the individual's salary is determined, whether on a salary schedule or within a range established by a merit system. Thus, suitably compensated, such considerations need not apply to academic rank qualifications. It seems immaterial whether a candidate's training and experience accrued from a job or a school. Since all junior college faculty members are assumed to have at least a bachelor's degree, it is therefore proposed that one year of experience be allowed for every 30 semester hours (45 quarter hours) of successful related and applicable graduate study at an accredited institution, regardless of when earned after receiving the bachelor's degree. Thus, a faculty member may receive a double annual salary increase if he attains his 30th hour of graduate study during the preceding year. If a higher degree is awarded, it may have ramifications in academic ranking as proposed later.

As previously stated, <u>performance</u> is of first importance in promotion. This may be broken down into the two inseparable components, knowledge of subject matter and teaching ability, plus the non-teaching activities. Evaluation procedures have already been outlined. The department head is the official in the best position to adjudge a faculty member and make suitable recommendations. The individual's enthusiasm and ability to inspire students are difficult to assess from higher up without the day-to-day contact experienced at a lower level. Non-teaching activities such as willingness to participate in departmental affairs, serve on committees, sponsor clubs, etc. are readily assessed.

<u>Educational attainment</u> requirements for each rank are specifically proposed, since junior college requirements would differ greatly from four-

year college or university requirements. Provision is made for entry into the lower three ranks without necessitating acquirement of a higher degree. Hours stated are semester hours from accredited institutions in field of specialization, or related fields including education. One hundred fifty per cent (150%) of the stated number in quarter hours would be required. All requirements stated are minimum requirements.

Instructor	B.A. or B.S.
Assistant Professor	Bachelor's plus 30 hours or M.A. or M.S.
Associate Professor	Bachelor's plus 75 hours or master's plus 30 hours or doctorate
Professor	Master's plus 60 hours or doctorate.

Professional standing and growth is of secondary importance in the junior college when compared to the former two criteria. Such is not the case at the four-year college or university. Indications of attainment of this requirement may be in evidence in the form of participation in seminars and conferences, grants, consultantships, professional society memberships and activities, publications, and additional study.

Community service, again of secondary importance, may be in evidence in the form of civic club membership and participation, community and charitable fund raising, local political activity, etc.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Academic rank is experiencing increasing consideration and acceptance in both public and private junior colleges. Adoption of academic rank is instigated by the administration more often than any other group. Possibly, this is an effort to produce a faculty which is more resourceful, more mentally lert, more self-sufficient and independent, and of higher general intelligence, such characteristics having been found to be descriptive of faculties with academic rank.

2. The appointive area of administration is a perilous area for deans and department heads responsible for recommending appointments, since it is purported that most mistakes made by them are made in this area. This is not surprising, since evaluations based on grades, biased recommendations, and a single best-foot-forward type interview are bound to involve a large extent of guesswork. A procedure for obtaining a more accurate evaluation is proposed.

3. Promotion within a system of academic rank is usually based on teaching proficiency, professional growth, time-in-rank and/or extent of previous experience, publications, institutional and/or community service, and personality characteristics. The weight of consideration given each criterion varies with the type of school and its objectives. Usually, the promotion candidate is not expected to excel in all areas; if he is outstanding in at least one area and above average in two or more of the remaining areas, he is eligible for promotion. Level of expected attainment varies according to academic rank for which the candidate is being considered. Criteria are proposed which specifically exclude time-in-rank or previous experience as a requirement for promotion. The weight of consideration to be given each criterion is suggested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blocker, Clyde E., "Academic Rank in Two-Year Colleges," Junior College Journal, 35 (December-January, 1964-65).

Blocker, Clyde E. et al, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Frieberger, H. T. and W. H. Crawford, "Junior College Academic Rank and Title," Junior College Journal, 33 (October, 1962).

Harrington, John C., "Academic Rank in the Community College," Junior College Journal, 35 (March, 1965).

Hendrix, Vernon L., "Academic Rank: Mostly Peril?" Junior College Journal, 34 (December-January, 1963-64).

Hendrix, Vernon L., "Academic Rank Revisited," Junior College Journal, 35 (February, 1965).

Letters to the Editor, Junior College Journal, 35 (March, 1965).

Los Angeles City Schools, "Plan for Establishment of Academic Rank in the Colleges in the Los Angeles College District," Los Angeles: Los Angeles City Schools, 1964.

Miami-Dade Junior College, "Criteria for Academic Rank," Miami: Miami-Dade Junior College, 1963.

Millet, Fred B., Professor, New York: The McMillan Company, 1961.

Newburn, H. K., Faculty Personnel Policies in State Universities, Missoula: Montana State University, 1959.

Shapiro, Charles, "In Defense of the Publishing Teacher," Junior College Journal, 34 (March, 1964).

Tillery, Dale, "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril?" Junior College Journal, 33 (February, 1963).

Wilson, Logan, The Academic Man. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Woodburne, L. S., Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Woodburne, L. S., Principles of College and University Administration, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wright, Robert L., "A Study of Rank in American Higher Education," Junior College Journal, 27 (November, 1956).